

## Lane County Public Works Replace Cost Accounting Software Project Timeline and Summary

2007												2008								2009												
April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June						
IS / Business Needs Identified and Defined		Consultant Selection	Process Review	RFP			Evaluate Proposals			First Demonstrations. Review & Evaluations			Reference Checks			Survey Local Cities and Counties about Cost Accounting			Second Demonstrations. Review & Evaluations		CAO, ISSC, PW MGMT, TMT, F&A			BCC, begin contract draft, discovery, and organize implementation teams			Contract team established to complete contract, draft RFPS for implementation consultant, finalize contract.			Select Implementation Consultant, Negotiate contract (if necessary), begin implementation process		

<b>IS / Business Needs Identified and Defined</b>	Public Works and IS staff met and evaluated our current and future business needs, the current cost accounting system and its status. It was determined that our current cost accounting system is deteriorating and that the Microsoft Access based system will no longer be supported by the software vendor. ORS requirements regarding the need for Public Works to have a cost accounting system were reviewed.
<b>Consultant Selection</b>	A cost accounting selection team was established with members from: Public Works, IS, County Administration, and Finance. Representation from other departments was seen as an opportunity to show other departments the potential applications of cost accounting technology. Through a Request for Professional Services (RFPS) process, the Team selected SoftResources as our consultant to help us select and/or implement a new cost accounting system.
<b>Process Review</b>	With the services of SoftResources and collaboration with the selection team, Public Works reviewed their current business processes and utilization of cost accounting. Codes for financial accounts, activity, projects, existing reporting tools, etc. were all reviewed and analyzed to assist PW in developing their future cost accounting needs, expectations, and vision. The result of this process became sections 3: Current Environment, Section 4: Project Scope & Timeline, and Section 6: Vendor and System Requirements of the RFP document.
<b>RFP</b>	Draft and publish RFP based upon SoftResources suggestions, IS/Business needs review, Process Review, and ORS requirements. Received five (5) proposals.
<b>Evaluate Proposals</b>	Met as a selection team to evaluate the bid proposals with the assistance of SoftResources. After review, three (3) vendors were elevated to the next phase of the selection process: Vendor Software Demonstration.
<b>First Demonstrations. Review &amp; Evaluations</b>	After the demonstrations were completed, the selection team created two evaluation tools to evaluate each demo: Demo Report and Demo Evaluation Summary. The former was a qualitative tool and the later was a quantitative tool. After review, it was determined that Dekker, Ltd would be elevated to the next phase of reference checks and further technical evaluation. The selection team also decided that it would invite PeopleSoft, the incumbent ERP financial software, to demonstrate their cost accounting software module (Project Costing). Since Lane County currently owns the Project Costing module within PeopleSoft Financials, but has not implemented it, Public Works determined that a closer investigation into the PeopleSoft software tool would be beneficial. A PeopleSoft implementer and Lane County's PeopleSoft corporate representatives subsequently gave a demonstration. After the PeopleSoft demo, it was determined that PeopleSoft would be elevated to the next phase of reference checks and further technical evaluation.
<b>Reference Checks</b>	Public Works requested and received multiple references from each of the two elevated vendors. Using a standardized questionnaire, Public Works contacted each reference. The reference checks provided some insight into the overall satisfaction and use of the software from each user. All references contacted that used Dekker Ltd were satisfied overall, with one reference being "terrifically" satisfied. All references using Dekker reported that "very few modifications" were needed to the system out-of-the-box and they had no problems interfacing with PeopleSoft. They also reported that they "have been able to easily break down projects and build reports any way [they] want." Half of the references contacted that use PeopleSoft were satisfied overall, with one reference being "very pleased." PeopleSoft references that made little or no modifications to the system reported being pleased with the system. They also reported that PeopleSoft standardized reports, custom Crystal Reports, and other custom reports were used for Reporting. The references that reported they were not pleased with PeopleSoft often stated problems due to customizations and the necessity of extensive IT staff support.
<b>Survey Local Cities and Counties about Cost Accounting</b>	In an effort to gain a general understanding of how other similar local governments are using cost accounting, Public Works staff created and executed a local Cost Accounting Use Survey. Public Works surveyed ten (10) local governments. This survey revealed what cost accounting system they were using, how satisfied they were with the system, how they were using the system. This survey provided a good sense of how other local governments are capturing costs, how efficient they believe they are at capturing those costs, and how satisfied they were with the software that helped them carry out those tasks. The survey revealed that nearly each local government was using a different system and that nearly all surveyed were using multiple systems (many built in-house) in order to meet their cost accounting needs. It also revealed that many of them were unsatisfied with their current cost accounting system and were looking to replace it soon. Most requested that Lane County communicate to them the overall outcome of this process upon project completion.
<b>Second Demo. Review &amp; Eval.</b>	After completing the first demonstration, reference checks, and survey, Public Works staff, with assistance from SoftResources, created the "Software Functionality Success Criteria" script for each of the returning vendors to follow during their second technical demonstration. This document requested further detail and functional demonstration of their software system. The selection team and Public Works staff considered this the most important and valid expectation of a cost accounting software system and included: General Functionality, Technology Integration, Activity Based Costing, and Scenario demonstration. The software that best met the success criteria would be considered for procurement.
<b>CAO, Tony, PW MGMT, TMT, F&amp;A</b>	This project is currently 17 months into the process and several changes have occurred county-wide and within Public Works during this time. In an effort to receive additional feedback from County Admin, IT, and others interested in the potential use of a viable cost accounting system, Public Works will meet with the County Administration Office, the IT Manager, the Public Works Management Team, TMT, and F&A. It is anticipated that these meetings will assist Public Works in selecting the vendor for implementation.
<b>Begin contract draft, discovery, and organize implementation teams</b>	After receiving feedback from ISSC and Finance and Audit, Public Works prepared a board packet for the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) with recommendations from Public Works and these committees to select the Dekker PMIS cost accounting module to meet the needs of Public Works and with an option for other departments within Lane County to implement the system. The BCC unanimously voted in favor of implementing the Dekker PMIS system. An Intent to Purchase letter was sent to Dekker and drafting the procurement and implementation contract began.
<b>Contract team established to complete contract, draft RFPS for implementation consultant, finalize contract.</b>	After further experience and feedback from county counsel, it was determined that a procurement and implementation contracting team would need to be established in order to cover the highly complex and detailed nature of the contract. This team met weekly for three months to review new updates of the contract. The County's final draft was completed in the first week of April and sent to Dekker for review. A request for professional services (RFPS) was drafted to enlist the services of a cost accounting expert to help Lane County Public Works with their implementation process. Consultant recruiting advertisements were sent to two publications during the second week of April.
<b>Select Implementation Consultant, Negotiate contract (if necessary), begin implementation process</b>	Selection of the cost accounting expert RFPS are scheduled for May 8, 2009. It is anticipated that some contract negotiations will occur between Dekker, Ltd. and Lane County for the procurement and implementation of the Dekker PMIS system during this time. As soon as the contract is agreed upon and executed between both parties, an implementation schedule will be created between Dekker, Ltd. and Lane County, with the assistance of the cost accounting expert, and the implementation process will begin and move toward completion. Lane County Public Works' current expectation is to have the implementation process take approximately six (6) months with an anticipated "Go Live" date of November 5, 2009.